



---

## 2006 Decisions

---

## Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

4-5-2006

## Govt of VI v. Barton

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2006](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2006)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Govt of VI v. Barton" (2006). *2006 Decisions*. 1316.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2006/1316](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2006/1316)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2006 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 05-1341

---

GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS,

Appellant

v.

CHRISTOPHER BARTON

---

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

(D.C. No. 04-cr-00089)

Chief District Judge: The Honorable Raymond L. Finch

District Judge: The Honorable Thomas K. Moore

Territorial Judge: The Honorable Darryl Dean Donohue

---

ARGUED DECEMBER 5, 2005

BEFORE: SCIRICA, Chief Judge, McKee and Nygaard, Circuit Judges.

(Filed :April 5, 2006)

---

Richard S. Davis, Esq. (Argued)  
Office of Attorney General of Virgin Islands  
Department of Justice  
34-38 Kronprindsens Gade  
GERS Building, Second Floor  
Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, USVI 00802

Counsel for Appellant

Andrew C. Simpson, Esq. (Argued)  
5025 Anchor Way, Suite One  
Gallows Bay  
Christiansted, St. Croix, USVI 00820

Counsel for Appellee

---

OPINION OF THE COURT

---

NYGAARD, Circuit Judge.

The issue in this appeal is whether a copy of a court order, submitted in an attempt to establish the finality of a Florida custody order, was properly admitted into evidence during the trial of Christopher Barton for concealing a material fact from a government agency. The Territorial Court admitted the copy into evidence and, based entirely on the admitted copy, a jury convicted Barton. On appeal, the Appellate Division of the District Court (consisting of three District judges) reversed and vacated the sentence. We agree substantially with the Appellate Division's opinion that the copy was not admissible under any relevant Federal Rule of Evidence. Accordingly, we will affirm the Appellate Division's order vacating Barton's conviction.